23.11.04

Neo-Functionalism, European Identity, and the Puzzles of European Integration

by

Thomas Risse

Prepared for Tanja Börzel (ed), *The Disparity of European Integration. Revisiting Neofunctionalism in Honour of Ernst B. Haas*, Special Issue of the *Journal of European Public Policy*

Adresse des Autors/Author's Address:
Center for Transatlantic Foreign and Security Policy
Otto Suhr Institute of Political Science
Freie Universität Berlin
Ihnestr. 22
14195 Berlin
Tel.: +49 (0) 30 838 55527
Fax: +49 (0) 30 838 54160
Email: risse@zedat.fu-berlin.de
Web: http://www.fu-berlin.de/atasp

Abstract

This article concentrates on the relationship between neofunctionalist reasoning and the study of collective identities. Recent research confirms what Ernst B. Haas already knew in 1958, namely, that transferring loyalty to Europe and the EU is possible without giving up one's national (or regional or local or gender) identities. But preliminary results challenge the assumption that the transfer of loyalties unto the European level simply followed from the material benefits received through European integration. At the same time, the evidence suggests that socialization into European identity works not so much through transnational processes or through exposure to European institutions, but on the national levels in a process whereby Europeanness or "becoming European" is gradually being embedded in understandings of national identities. This latter reasoning also sheds light on the double puzzle of European integration, i.e. the persistent balance in the EU's constitution-building between supranational and intergovernmental institutions, on the one hand, and the lagging behind of foreign/defense affairs in European integration, on the other. If national processes and collective understandings are crucial to understanding the Europeanization of national identities, this will lead to uneven and varied degrees to which Europe can be embedded in collective identities. Federal states with respective constitutional traditions change their collective understandings more easily to include Europe and orientations toward supranationalism than unitary and centralized states.

Keywords: Ernst B. Haas, neofunctionalism, European identity, supranationalism, European foreign policy

> Then came along the political project of creating a united Europe, which had the result of creating a myriad of institutions in which very, very many people participated. … These institutions developed a permanence through which both French and German … learned to do routine business with each other every day. A problem which they experienced was a common problem. … first comes the traumatic lesson, then comes the institution for learning to deal with each other. (Haas 2000, p. 16)

Introduction

It took four intellectual heavyweights – John G. Ruggie, Peter J. Katzenstein, Robert O. Keohane, and Philippe C. Schmitter - to write an article on the scholarly contributions of Ernst B. Haas, another intellectual giant (Ruggie et al. 2005).[1] Thus, writing about "potential gaps or explanatory weaknesses of Haas' neofunctionalist thinking (to) be compensated by using your own preferred theoretical approach" (the editor's assignment to authors for this special issue) represents quite a daunting task. My own "preferred approach" is probably meant to be moderate social constructivism, or, in Ernst and Peter Haas' terms, "pragmatic constructivism" (Haas and Haas 2002; see also Adler 1997, 2002).[2]

To make my task a bit easier, let me first state what I will *not* do in this essay. I will not discuss here whether or not neo-functionalism can be subsumed under social constructivism as its meta-theory or, worse, whether Ernst B. Haas was a social constructivist, for two reasons. First, one should not press an intellectual giant into the confines of any "ism." Second, Haas himself has already said all there is to say about the subject, first in the volume on the "Social Construction of Europe," and then in the above-quoted article with his son (Haas 2001; Haas and Haas 2002).[3] I take it from these two contributions that Haas pretty much sympathized with those of us sitting on the fence between moderate constructivism and soft rationalism.

What is this article about then? I take as my starting point Ernst B. Haas's famous definition of political integration as "the process whereby political actors in several distinct national settings are persuaded to shift their loyalties, expectations, and political activities toward a new centre, whose institutions possess or demand jurisdiction over the pre-existing national states" (Haas 1958, 16). Among the more under-explored parts of that conceptualization is the "shifting loyalties" part which I translate into a statement about collective identity formation, a subject matter dear to social constructivists. The first part of the article then engages in a conversation between Ernst B. Haas' own writing on the subject and most recent progress in the study of European identity. I then go on to use these insights to analyze what identity-related research can contribute to exploring the puzzle

of disparities in European integration (see Börzel 2005). I concentrate on two issues which both refer to the scope or depth of integration:

1. How can we explain the continuing and uneasy balance between supranational and intergovernmental solutions in the institutional make-up of the European Union (EU) which has endured since the Treaty of Rome all the way through the Constitutional Treaty?
2. Why is it that European foreign and security policy remains the one policy area lagging behind in integration and continues to be based on consensual decision-making by the member states even if the Constitutional Treaty will enter into force?

The article concludes with a summary and an outlook into the future.

How Much Loyalty for Europe Is Enough?

It is interesting to note that the two founding fathers of integration theory – Karl W. Deutsch and Ernst B. Haas – both include identity-related concepts into their conceptualizations. While Haas talks about "shifting loyalties" toward supranational institutions (see above), Deutsch includes a "sense of community" into his conceptualization of integration (Deutsch and et al. 1957, 5-6, 9). As Deutsch et al. put it: "The kind of sense of community that is relevant for integration … turned out to be rather a matter of mutual sympathy and loyalties; of 'we-feeling,' trust, and mutual consideration; or partial identification in terms of self-images and interests…" (Deutsch and et al. 1957, 36; Haas who was otherwise rather critical of Deutsch's security community argument, quotes this passage approvingly in Haas 1958, 5, fn. 1). Thus, collective identification with institutions beyond the nation-state becomes a major yardstick for measuring integration.

In these initial statements, however, it remains a bit unclear how identity-building relates to integration. For Karl W. Deutsch, collective identification with the community was one of the indicator for the degree of integration (see also Adler and Barnett 1998, on this), i.e., part of the dependent variable. The same holds true for Ernst B. Haas's famous definition of integration, as quoted above. Yet, he never assumed that collective identification with European institutions was the starting point of integration: "The 'good Europeans' are not the main creators of the regional community that is growing up; the process of community formation is dominated by nationally constituted groups with specific interests and aims, willing and able to adjust their aspirations by turning to supranational means when this course appears profitable" (Haas 1958, xiv; see also ibid., 13; Haas 1970, 627). He assumed more or less instrumentally rational actors to orient themselves

toward supranational solutions in order to further their interests. While he was a Weberian "soft rationalist" insofar as he assumed values and ideas as being an intrinsic part of actors's interests (Haas 2001, 27), he never argued that identification with Europe was a necessary starting condition for integration. Rather, he seems to have assumed some kind of positive feedback loop in the sense that instrumental interests lead to initial integration (transfer of authority to a "new centre") which then leads to increasing identification with the "new centre" ("shifting loyalties") resulting in further integration.

Interestingly enough, in "Uniting for Europe," we find some interesting arguments about "multiple loyalties." Referring to Guetzkow (Guetzkow 1955), Haas argued that "shifts in the focus of loyalty need not necessarily imply the immediate repudiation of the national state or government" (Haas 1958, 14). According to Haas, actors acquire new loyalties, because

(1) they value the new center of attachment as an end in itself,

(2) the new center of authority pressures them into conformity, or

(3) as a side-product of otherwise instrumental behavior toward another ultimate end.

In "Beyond the Nation-State," he clarified the third mechanism insofar as he assumed that satisfaction with the organization's performance would lead to shifting loyalties (Haas 1964, 49). "If the process of developing dual loyalties via this mechanism continues for a sufficiently protracted period, the new central institutions may ultimately acquire the symbolic significance of end values" (Haas 1958, 14-15).

Taken together, the three causal mechanisms can be conceptualized as an ongoing socialization process by which actors internalize the values and norms of the community (on European integration as a socialization mechanism see Checkel forthcoming-a). When the new supranational institutions acquire "the symbolic significance of end values," socialization appears to be complete in that actors have internalized its values and norms as part of their collective identities. Haas seemed to have imagined identification with supranational institutions as an incremental process that works via both logics of "consequentialism" and of "appropriateness" (March and Olsen 1989, 1998).

The first identification mechanism seems to pertain to the "good Europeans," i.e. those actors who support European integration for ideational and identity reasons (an "end in itself"). While Haas himself dismissed this mechanism as largely irrelevant for integration, Craig Parsons has recently argued against both neofunctionalists and liberal intergovernmentalists that we should not overlook the significance of ideational factors in the early days of European integration (Parsons 2002; Parsons 2003). The second causal mechanism ("pressure into conformity") could be understood as a process of habitualization. Actors get increasingly used to the supranational institution

which then leads to loyalty transfers. These two mechanism both work via the logic of appropriateness rather than through instrumental utility-maximization.

The third mechanism combines the two logics. The more actors are satisfied with the institution's performance to meet their interests ("logic of consequentialism"), the more they will identify with the institution ("logic of appropriateness"). In David Easton's language, specific support for the institution's output leads to increased diffuse support for the institution as such (Easton 1965). This final mechanism could be regarded as an ideational "spill-over" process.[4]

Unfortunately, Haas gave up on loyalty transfer later, preferring instead to talk about the transfer of authority and legitimacy (Haas 1970, 633). But he also started asking, "(h)ow do actors learn? Do percepton of benefits from changing transactions affect the definition of interests? Is there some other process of socialization at work?" (ibid., 622; see also Haas's later work on learning, particularly Haas 1990). When Haas abandoned European identity, European integration studies followed suit. Neofunctionalists would battle (liberal) intergovernmentalists and vice versa, but this fight was mainly about chapter 8 in "Uniting for Europe" ("The Expansive Logic of Sector Integration") focussing on "spill-over" effects and unintended consequences as well as about the nature and power of supranational institutions. It was lost in these battles that neofunctionalism and liberal intergovernmentalism agreed about theorizing about European integration "from the domestic bottom up" and shared a soft rationalist ontology, while disagreeing about the process.[5] Then "multi-level governance" came along as the game in the European town trying to differentiate itself from both neofunctionalism and (liberal) intergovernmentalism (e.g. Hooghe and Marks 2001; Jachtenfuchs and Kohler-Koch 2003). "Shifting loyalties" as a defining feature of political integration was largely lost as an object of study. Up to the early 1990s, the conventional wisdom simply held that European integration was somehow marching along without any noticeable transfers of loyalty from the nation-states to the European level.

More than 45 years after the publication of "Uniting for Europe," however, exploring European identity has assumed center-stage in European studies. Moreover and through the combined effort of quantitative sociologists, experimental psychologists, hermeneutic discourse analysts, and political scientists, a new scholarly consensus has emerged that strikingly resembles Ernst B. Haas's original thoughts on multiple loyalties in 1958 (for the following see particularly Herrmann, Brewer, and Risse 2004; see also Risse 2003). In fact, Haas was exactly right in his thinking about multiple loyalties. It is wrong to conceptualize European identity in zero-sum terms, as if an increase in European identity necessarily decreases one's loyalty to national or other communities. Europe and the nation are both "imagined communities" (Anderson 1991) and people can feel as part of both communities without having to choose some primary identification. Survey data sug-

gest and social psychological experiments confirm that many people, who strongly identify with their nation-state, also feel a sense of belonging to Europe (Citrin and Sides 2004). Analyses from Eurobarometer data and other sources show that "country first, but Europe, too" is the dominant outlook in most EU countries and people do not perceive this as contradictory. The real cleavage in mass opinion consists between those who only identify with their nation and those perceiving themselves as attached to both their nation and Europe. Nationalists are far less likely to support European integration than those who at least partially also identify with Europe (Carey 2002). Moreover, as Marks and Hooghe show, identity is a stronger predictor for support for European integration than economic rationality (Hooghe and Marks 2004).

Thus, Ernst B. Haas got it right already in the late 1950s that European integration would lead to dual or multiple identities. What is less clear, however, is what the concept of "multiple identities" actually means. The empirical findings reported above confirm the truism that people hold multiple identities and that Europe and the EU can be easily incorporated in people's sense of community. There are at least two ways in which we can think of multiple identities pertaining to territorial and political spaces.[6] First, identities can be *nested*, conceived of as concentric circles or Russian Matruska dolls, one inside the next. My identity as Rhinelander is nested in my German identity, which is again nested in my Europeanness. We find the "Russian Matruska doll" model of European and other identities on both the levels of elites and of ordinary people. This model suggests some hierarchy between people's sense of belonging and loyalties. European and other identities pertaining to territorially defined entities can be nested into each other so that "Europe" forms the outer boundary, while one's region or nation-state constitute the core.

There is a second way of conceptualizing the relationship between European and national identities which people might hold. We could call it a "marble cake" model of multiple identities. Accordingly, the various components of an individual's identity cannot be neatly separated on different levels as the concept of nestedness implies. What if identity components influence each other, mesh and blend into each other? What if my self-understanding as German inherently contains aspects of Europeanness? Can we really separate a Catalan from a European identity? Most empirical work on European identity does not explicitly deal with such "marble cake" concept. Yet, most of the evidence is actually consistent with it, starting with the "nation first, Europe second" identification found in the Eurobarometer data.

One corollary of the "marble cake" model is that European identity might mean different things to different people. EU membership, for example, might lead to an identity change, which impacts upon the previous national identity. Since EU membership identity then interacts with rather different national identity constructions, the overall effect will not be homogenous leading to

a generalized EU identity. Rather, Europe and the EU become enmeshed with given national identities leading to rather diverging identity outcomes. This concerns, above all, the content and substance of what it means to identify with Europe. Indeed, our own longitudinal study of political discourses about Europe among the major parties in France, Germany, and Great Britain revealed that the meaning of Europe varied considerably (Marcussen et al. 1999; for similar findings see Diez Medrano 2003). For the German political elites, "Europe" and European integration meant overcoming one's own nationalist and militarist past. The French elites, in contrast, constructed Europe as the externalization of distinct French values of Republicanism, enlightenment and the *mission civilisatrice*. While French and German political elites managed to embed Europe into their understandings of national identity, the British elites constructed Europe in contrast to their understandings of the nation, particularly the English nation. This qualitative analysis is consistent with some quantitative data according to which there is variation in the degree to which even "nationalists" who solely identify with their nation-state, support European integration. Portuguese nationalists are still more likely to support the EU than, say, British nationalists (Hooghe and Marks 2004). This can only be understood and explained if we assume that the notion of being Portuguese already contains some attachment to Europe, while this is far less the case for the idea of Britishness.

Haas was also right in his assumption that the EU was and is essentially an elite-driven project – similar to other nation-building projects. No wonder that identification with and support for Europe and its institutions is highest among political and social elites. Eurobarometer data demonstrate an enormous gap between elite support (in fact, elite *consensus*) for the EU, on the one hand, and widespread skepticism among the larger public, on the other (see e.g. Spence 1998). The difference between elite and citizen identification with Europe can be largely explained by how "real" Europe is for people. Social psychologists refer to the concept of "entitativity" (Castano 2004). An imagined community becomes real in people's lives when they increasingly share cultural values, a perceived common fate, increased salience, and boundedness. The EU is certainly very *real* for Europe's political, economic, and social elites.

For the citizens in general, the EU is still a more distant community than the nation-state, despite the fact that EU rules and regulations cover almost every political issue-area by now. There are at least three reasons for this. First, while EU law is the law of the land, has direct effect, and overrides national law, EU authorities do not implement European rules and regulations, but national and subnational authorities do. Thus, when citizens are confronted with, say, environmental regulations in their daily lives, they rarely know that these are EU rules. Second and more important, 'Europe' has fuzzy boundaries. While there are plenty of indicators telling me that I have left Germany, it is unclear when I have left "Europe." Yet, boundedness is a crucial ingredient for the

psychological reality of a community in people's lives. Third, the elite discourse about the EU is ambivalent at best when it comes to 'shared values' and 'common fate.' On the one hand, there is the conscious identity construction of a liberal and civic community emanating from EU institutions. On the other hand, national policy-makers routinely reify the nation-state in their dealings with Brussels. Whenever they charge the EU for some tough decision at home, they adopt a populist rhetoric of conscious blame-shifting ("Brussels made me do it").

But Haas was not that much concerned about mass public opinion and the loyalties of the ordinary citizens, as he regarded European integration an elite affair. While he was right in general concerning elite attitudes toward the EU – strong support and collective identification as well as multiple loyalties to the EU and that nation-state -, it is less clear whether his assumed causal mechanisms, namely some degree of socialization, actually hold (for the following see particularly Checkel forthcoming-a; Checkel forthcoming-b). When it comes to the three causal socialization mechanisms identified in Haas's work (see above), the jury is still out.

Let me start with the third mechanism identified above, namely identification as a side-product of otherwise instrumental behavior. Haas seemed to have assumed in this context that those who profit the most from European integration, also are more likely to shift their loyalties toward Europe than others. If this were true, two groups should be much more supportive of European integration than they actually are. First, farmers are arguably the one professional group that profits most from the EU which spends by far the largest percentage of its budget on the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). Yet, there is no indication that farmer identify with the EU to any considerable degree. Their satisfaction with the EU's performance appears also to be rather low. Second, we would expect women to be in general more supportive for European integration than men, given that it was the EU that pushed gender equality, particularly equal treatment and equal pay in the workplace (Caporaso and Jupille 2001). Yet, there is a gender gap in support for the EU with men being in general more supportive to integration than women (Liebert and Sifft 2003; Nelson and Guth 2000).

As to the first and second mechanisms mentioned above, it remains unclear which of the two causal arrows is stronger: Does strong identification with Europe lead to support for European integration and for EU institutions? Or does involvement and interaction with EU institutions lead to stronger identification with Europe?

On the one hand, Jeffrey Lewis's work on COREPER, the Committee of Permanent Representatives, in particular appears to show socialization effects through strong involvement with European institutions. New members of COREPER are quickly socialized into the rules of the game

and many of the national permanent representatives to the EU adopt a "double hatted" loyalty to their nation-state and to the EU (Lewis 1998a, b; Lewis forthcoming; see also Laffan 2004).

On the other hand, Liesbet Hooghe shows that the reverse causal arrow also seems to hold. While she finds that Commission officials support European integration much more strongly than national bureaucrats, the sees little socialization at work. Only those who enter the Commission at a relatively young age appear to be socialized in support for the EU, while all others already come to Brussels with strong and positive attitudes toward European integration (Hooghe 2001; Hooghe forthcoming). Public opinion research also seems to point in the direction that identity strengthens support for the EU rather than vice versa (Citrin and Sides 2004; Hooghe and Marks 2004).

In sum, while Ernst B. Haas was right on target concerning his conceptualisation of multiple loyalties, we still do not know for sure whether his assumed causal mechanisms – socialization into stronger identification with Europe combining expected benefits from integration with an incremental habitualization process – hold true. We still know too little about the causal relationship between multiple incl. European identities, on the one hand, and European institutions, on the other. At least one of Haas's assumed causal mechanism in both "Uniting for Europe" and in his 1970 article – perception of benefits from the EU → re-definition of interests → European identity – does not seem to hold. Moreover, the two other mechanisms, while contradictory at first glance, might actually be complementary. European institutions might well exert some identity pull toward European elites and citizens, while strong identification with the EU might increase the support for and the legitimacy of the EU. This has important repercussions for the two puzzles of European integration to which I will now turn.

The Double Puzzle of European Integration

There are two puzzles in the European integration process from a neo-functionalist viewpoint that require further exploration:

1. What explains the continuing balance in the institutional make-up of the EU between intergovernmental and supranational institutions that continues to persist all the way up to the Constitutional Treaty?
2. Why are external aspects of European security policy still not integrated, while its internal aspects have moved much further along toward communitarization?

Supranationalism versus Intergovernmentalism

As to the first question, the "expansive logic of sector integration" (Haas 1958, ch. 8) and its "spill-over" effects explain to a surprisingly large degree why ever more policy sectors have become integrated and communitarized during the European integration process. To that extent, there is no need to discard neo-functionalism. Yet, if we follow the logic of Haas's arguments, we would probably have expected that the power of EU supranational institutions such as the Commission, the European Parliament, and the European Court of Justice constantly increase in parallel to sector integration at the expense of intergovernmental institutions such as the European Council and the Council of Ministers. While the transition to qualified majority voting (QMV) implies a loss of veto power for individual member states, it affects the balance between the various institutions only indirectly. One could argue, for example, that the agenda-setting power of the Commission is strengthened under QMV, because it need not fear vetoes by indidividual member states.[7] But we can see over the past almost twenty years since the Single European Act that those who would have predicted the Commission to become some sort of European government, have been proven wrong. From Maastricht via Amsterdam and Nice all the way to the Constitutional Treaty, the balance of power between particularly the Council and the Commission has reached a rather stable equilibrium, even though the "expansive logic of sector integration" and communitarization continued steadily to run its course. How can we explain this situation?

The first-cut answer pertains, of course, to the intergovernmental logic of treaty negotiations in the EU (Moravcsik 1998). Altering the balance of power among the EU institutions concerns constitutional issues which are the prerogative of the member states as "masters of the treaties." Moreover, these are among the most contested questions in the union, because they relate to the "finalité politique" of the EU, a debate which has recently gained momentum again following German foreign minister Joschka Fischer's speech at Humboldt University in 2000 (Joerges, Mény, and Weiler 2000). Since the member states cannot agree on whether the EU should remain a fundamentally intergovernmental institution or whether it should move in the direction of a federal state, the continuous stalemate between the Commission and the Council is exactly what one would expect.

What, however, explains the rather stable preferences of the EU member states when it comes to such thorny constitutional questions? It is here where both neo-functionalism and its main competitor, liberal intergovernmentalism, come to a screeching halt in their explanatory power. For both neo-functionalism and liberal intergovernmentalism take economic interdependence as the starting condition for explaining member states preferences. They just assume different causal mechanisms as to how sectorial preferences translate into integration outcomes (see Haas 2001, 30,

fn. 10, on this point). The two integration theories might be able to explain the variation between communitarized versus non-communitarized sectors (but see below). But they do not really address the question whether communitarization works via instituting qualified majority voting in the Council or via strengthening the powers of the Commission or via a combination of both. Ultimately, of course, liberal intergovernmentalism predicts that constitutional powers will remain with the member states, while neo-functionalism would expect an ever increasing role for supranational institutions. But still, neither approach can explain the constitutional preferences of the member states.

A focus on collective identities might help in this context. Why is it that federal member states consistently favor federal solutions for the institutional make-up of the EU, while unitary member states usually prefer strengthening the intergovernmental pillar (see Koenig-Archibugi 2004)? As Markus Jachtenfuchs has demonstrated in detail, there is a clear correlation between a member state's constitutional tradition and its preferences for institutional solutions at the EU level (Jachtenfuchs 2002). Federally organized member states which are used to share sovereignty among the various levels of territorial governance are more than willing to give up sovereignty when it comes to the EU. The Federal Republic of Germany is perhaps the most striking example in this context. Its cooperative federalism is based on the principle of shared sovereignty between the federal level and the *Laender* (Börzel 2002). For the past forty years, Germany has been more than willing to give up national sovereignty in favor of strengthened European integration.

The United Kingdom, in contrast, represents a unitary state, inspite of all recent efforts at regional devolution. With the one exception of Margret Thatcher's endorsement of qualified majority voting during the negotiations leading up to the Single European Act, British leaders have consistently rejected strengthening supranational institutions of the EU. The British dominant discourse – whether among the political elites or in the mass media – strongly emphasizes intergovernmentalism (Marcussen et al. 1999).

But how can we explain that a country's constitutional tradition and experiences are linked to its preferences for intergovernmentalism versus supranationalism? Simon Bulmer and Peter Katzenstein have argued in this context that German experiences with a federal state are simply externalised unto the European level, since institutional isomorphism makes life so much easier for German policy-makers and bureaucrats to function within the Brussels framework (Bulmer 1997; Katzenstein 1997). If that were the case, Germany should have both more influence in the EU policy-making process and, as a result, a better compliance record with EU law than, say, Britain. Neither is true, of course. Britain's compliance with EU law and regulations is among the top EU member states, while Germany features somewhere in the middle (Börzel, Hofmann, and Sprungk

2003). I suggest that we have to unpack the notion of "constitutional tradition" to get a handle on the question. A country's institutional division of territorial powers (or lack thereof) is not just about formal constitutional questions. It also comes with a set of collective understandings what it means to be a "federal" or "unitary" state. That sovereignty can be shared or divided, for example, is deeply ingrained in the German collective identity pertaining to their state. That sovereignty resides in one single place, namely in the Parliament, is equally deeply ingrained in British understandings about the nation-state. This explains to a large degree the difficulties which Britain has continuously faced in accepting ceding sovereignty rights to the EU. It also accounts for the ease with which Germany has been prepared to support supranationalism.

Of course, the German dominant elite discourse on Europe also helps in this context, while the opposite is the case regarding Britain. German collective elite identity has deeply embraced the notion of a 'European Germany' (Thomas Mann) so that Germanness cannot be understood without reference to Europe. In particular, modern Germany is identified with supporting Europe and European integration as the ultimate proof that the country has overcome its nationalist and militarist past (Nazi Germany as the European "other", see Engelmann-Martin 2002; Risse and Engelmann-Martin 2002; see also Diez Medrano 2003). In contrast, British democracy does not need Europe for its own legitimation. Rather, 'Europe' constitutes the "friendly Other" in the British dominant discourse as a result of which British leaders usually sit on the fence when it comes to institutional questions of the EU.

In sum, the diverging member states preferences for the EU's institutional design and its *finalité politique* can be largely explained on the basis of their constitutional traditions and collective identities. A similar argument can be made with regard to the second neo-functionalist puzzle, which concerns the lagging behind of European foreign and security policy.

The Puzzle of European Foreign and Security Policy

Why has European foreign and security policy (CFSP/ESDP) not been communitarized yet, but remains the one and only dominantly intergovernmental pillar of the EU's policy-making structure even after the Constitutional Treaty will have entered into force? Early (neo-) functionalist reasoning confined spill-over effects and the like to "low politics," while the "high politics" of foreign and defense affairs was unlikely to be affected by these dynamics (see also Walter Mattli's contribution to this volume). Yet, the puzzle remains: It is unclear, for example, where the realms of "low politics" end and those of "high politics" begin. What about monetary sovereignty and the Maastricht

treaty's introduction of the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) leading up to the euro, the single currency? One could make the (ex post) argument that the single market including the four freedoms somehow required a single currency as its logical extension, i.e. that we can observe functional spill-over mechanisms into the "high politics" of monetary sovereignty here.

Similar arguments can be made with regard to internal security and home affairs. Internal security certainly concerns "high politics" insofar as it refers to a constitutive feature of the modern nation-state, namely its domestic sovereignty in terms of its monopoly over the use of force. If nation-states are prepared to give up domestic sovereignty in internal security affairs, why are they not prepared to do so when it comes to external security and defense? It is noteworthy in this context that the treaties of Maastricht pretty much put internal and external security on similar footing with regard to European integration. Both the second and the third pillars firmly remained intergovernmental in the Maastricht treaty. Since then, however, the speed increased with which Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) including aspects of internal security became integrated and were moved toward Qualified Majority Voting (QMV), while CFSP/ESDP remained in the intergovernmental camp. The Constitutional Treaty, should it ever enter into force, will remove the pillar structure of the treaties as a result of which most internal security questions will be subjected to QMV and co-decision procedures, while CFSP/ESDP remains the one EU policy-area in which supranational procedures still do not apply. Once again, one could argue that neo-functionalist spill-over mechanisms explain the incremental integration of internal security questions into "normal" EU decision-making procedures. The single market not only necessitated a single currency, but also the removal of internal borders leading up to the Schengen agreements. Once you remove internal border controls, however, internal security questions assume center-stage and must be integrated, too. At least, this is a plausible argument to explain why JHA have been subjected to same mechanisms of incremental integration as other EU policy areas.[8]

Thus, the distinction between "high" and "low" politics does not help in explaining the puzzle why foreign and defense affairs remain the odd one out in European integration. European integration has affected too many questions of "high politics" in the meantime, including core features of the modern nation-state such as monetary sovereignty and internal security.

International relations theory presents a ready-made explanation for the puzzle, of course: Realism – from Morgenthau to Waltz (Morgenthau 1948; Waltz 1979) – tells us that states are extremely unlikely to give up external sovereignty and the ultimate decision over war and peace. When the survival of the nation-state is at stake as in questions of war and peace, states do not share or pool sovereignty. There are two problems with this argument, though, which sounds plausible at first sight. First, realism itself is indeterminate in these questions. At least, one can distinguish a

version emphasizing that states are primarily "autonomy-seeking" from a variant of realism which focuses on "influence-seeking" behaviour (on these distinctions see Baumann, Rittberger, and Wagner 2001). The refusal to extend QMV to decisions over war and peace would be consistent with the realist argument that states are likely to preserve as much autonomy as possible.[9] As to the "influence-seeking" version of realism, however, things appear to be more complicated. If states seek to increase their power and influence in international politics, then the unwillingness of EU member states to give up external sovereignty in foreign and security affairs is outright self-defeating. The less Europe speaks with one voice in world politics, the less EU member states are able to influence outcomes. The European divisions over the Iraq war only serve to highlight this point. Europe remains divided, while the U.S. rules. Moreover and whatever the version of realism one adheres to, balancing is to be expected as the standard behaviour of nation-states. Balancing in a one-superpower world, however, requires pooling resources and building alliances. From this perspective, one would expect the EU to get its act together in foreign and security affairs in order to build a counter-weight to U.S. power. Yet, for all practical purposes, such European posturing seems to remain (French) wishful thinking for the time being.

Second, it is wrong that European states are not prepared to give up sovereignty in the realm of security and defense. Most EU member states are also members of the NATO alliance. While NATO is an intergovernmental organization built on the consensus rule when it comes to decision-making, it features a completely integrated military structure. Once decisions have been made with regard to war and peace, German and other troops of NATO members are prepared to die under the command of U.S., British, or French generals. In the post-Cold War environment, this is no longer hypothetical, but routinely the case in Bosnia, Afghanistan, and elsewhere. Moreover and perhaps more important, there is no agreement among EU member states that giving up sovereignty in the realm of foreign and defense affairs constitutes a bad idea. Rather, roughly two thirds of the current EU member states – let alone their populations – would be more than willing to supranationalize and to communitarize external security and national defense. Thus, realism only seems to apply to *some* countries such as the United Kingdom. To put it differently: If we want to account for the puzzle of European foreign and security policy, we must explain the variation among EU member states with regard to their preparedness to communitarize defense affairs.

We might be able to solve the puzzle of why CFSP/ESDP has not (yet) been communitarized if we do not conceptualize national sovereignty as a quasi-objective reality, but as an inter-subjective social construction. National sovereignty is a social construct that is deeply embedded in the collective identity of a nation-state (see e.g. Biersteker 2002; Biersteker and Weber 1996). Interestingly enough in this context, the only available empirical study that seeks to explain the

variation in the propensity of EU members to give up sovereignty in foreign and defense affairs, concludes that, once again, federal states are much more likely to prefer communitarization of external security and defense policies than unitary states (Koenig-Archibugi 2004; see also Hooghe 2001 on a related point). The same member states that prefer supranationalism over intergovernmentalism in general are also prepared to supranationalize foreign and defense policies. What is less clear, though, are the causal mechanisms linking territorial structures to preferences for a common European foreign and defense policy. I suggest that the social constructions and collective understandings that come with federalism might be key. As argued above, countries whose elites and citizens are used to the notion that sovereignty can be divided and/or shared between various levels of governance, are also more prepared to include supranational levels of governance in these understandings. Once one is prepared to accept supranationalism over intergovernmentalism in general, this might also extend into questions of war and peace. Borrowing from neo-functionalism, one could call this "ideational spill-over."

There is one further corollary on this issue. Those EU member states (such as Germany e.g.) who support a communitarized foreign and security policy are also those member states with mostly multilateral and cooperative foreign and security policies. They do not prefer a militarized European foreign and defense policy, but Europe as a "civilian power" (on this concept see Duchêne 1972; Maull 1990, among others). While a "civilian power" does not refuse to use military force under exceptional circumstances, the emphasis is clearly on cooperative security policy, multilateralism, and the rule of (international) law. The new European Security Strategy exemplifies the foreign policy outlook of a civilian power (European Council 2003). In contrast, the UK and France who are both rather centralized states and, given their traditions as colonial powers, have been more than willing to use military force if need be in the past, have also been rather reluctant to give up sovereignty concerning questions of war and peace. This leads me to speculate that federal states and civilian powers are more likely to support the communitarization foreign and defense affairs, because they are more prepared to share sovereignty anyway, on the one hand, but also prefer cooperative and multilateral foreign policies over unilateralism, on the other hand.

Conclusions

I have argued in this article that Ernst B. Haas was right when he talked in "Uniting for Europe" about "multiple loyalties" and identified various socialization mechanisms leading to European identity which combined the two logics of consequentialism and of appropriateness. One just needs

to remember that this book was published in 1958, i.e. long *before* European integration had reached a stage when one could reasonably expect such socialization processes to occur. Unfortunately, Haas and his followers in European integration studies quickly gave up on studying socialization processes and rather started intellectual fistfights between neo-functionalism and (liberal) intergovernmentalism. It was only during the 1990s that rigorous empirical research began taking up the challenge of studying collective identity-building processes surrounding European integration. This research quickly debunked the idea that European identity was only possible by overcoming national identities, but confirmed what Ernst B. Haas already knew in 1958, namely, that transferring loyalty to Europe and the EU is possible without giving up one's national (or regional or local or gender) identities (see Herrmann, Brewer, and Risse 2004).

As to the various socialization mechanisms identified by Haas, research has only started identifying the various causal pathways (see e.g. Checkel forthcoming-a). Preliminary results seem to challenge the assumption, though, held by Ernst B. Haas and other soft rationalists that the transfer of loyalties unto the European level simply followed from the material benefits received through European integration. If this were the case, farmers should be the most ardent supporters of the EU throwing their tomatoes at Euro-sceptics rather than at bureaucrats in Brussels. There simply seems to be little spill-over from the material into the ideational realms.

At the same time, there is some evidence suggesting that socialization into European identity works not so much through transnational processes or through exposure to European institutions, but on the national levels in a process whereby Europeanness or "becoming European" is gradually being embedded in understandings of national identities. The "marble cake" model of European identity which I outlined above, tries to conceptualize this process. This also suggests that the compatibility between European identity and national identities varies by country in a similar way as national constitutional traditions resonate with European integration to rather different degrees.

This latter reasoning might also shed light on the double puzzle of European integration, i.e. the persistent balance in the EU's constitution-building between supranational and intergovernmental institutions, on the one hand, and the lagging behind of foreign/defense affairs in European integration, on the other. If national processes and collective understandings are crucial to understanding the Europeanization of national identities, this will lead to uneven and varied degrees to which Europe can be embedded in collective identities. As argued above, federal states with respective constitutional traditions change their collective understandings to include Europe and orientations toward supranationalism more easily than unitary and centralized states.

If I am correct, we can speculate about the future of European integration: It is more than likely that foreign and defense affairs will follow other policy areas in gradually moving toward

qualified majority voting and the like, albeit in a more slowly fashion. Yet, the institutional balance between supranational and intergovernmental elements in the treaties will persist given the fundamental disagreements over the future of the EU among the member states and their populations which are deeply embedded in their own national and European identities.

References

Adler, E. (1997) 'Seizing the Middle Ground. Constructivism in World Politics', *European Journal of International Relations* 3 (3): 319-63.

--- (2002) 'Constructivism in International Relations', in W. Carlsnaes, B. Simmons, and T. Risse, (eds), *Handbook of International Relations,* London et al.: Sage, pp. 95-118

Adler, E., and Barnett, M. (1998) 'Security communities in theoretical perspective', in E. Adler and M. Barnett (eds), *Security Communities,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3-28.

Anderson, B. (1991) *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism,* London: Verso.

Baumann, R., Rittberger, V., and Wagner, W. (2001) 'Neorealist Foreign Policy Theory', in V. Rittberger (ed.), *German Foreign Policy Since Unification. Theories and Case Studies,* Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp. 37-67.

Biersteker, T. J. (2002) 'Forms of State, States of Sovereignty: The Changing Meanings of State, Sovereignty and Territory in the Theory and Practice of International Relations', in W. Carlsnaes, B. Simmons, and T. Risse (eds), *Handbook of International Relations,* London et al.: Sage, pp. 157-76.

Biersteker, T. J., and Weber, C. (eds) (1996) *State Sovereignty as Social Construct,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Börzel, T. A. (2002) *States and Regions in Europe. Institutional Adaptation in Germany and Spain,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

--- (2005) 'The Disparity of European Integration. Revisiting Neofunctionalism in Honour of Ernst B. Haas', *Journal of European Public Policy* 12 (2).

Börzel, T. A., Hofmann, T., and Sprungk, C. (2003) 'Einhaltung von Recht jenseits des Nationalstaats. Zur Implementationslogik marktkorrigierender Regelungen in der EU', *Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen* 10 (2): 247-86.

Bulmer, S. (1997) 'Shaping the Rules? The Constitutive Politics of the European Union and German Power', in P. J. Katzenstein (ed.), *Tamed Power. Germany in Europe,* Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 49-79.

Caporaso, J. A., and Jupille, J. (2001) 'The Europeanization of Gender Equality Policy and Domestic Structural Change', in M. Green Cowles, J. A. Caporaso, and T. Risse (eds), *Transforming Europe. Europeanization and Domestic Change,* Ithaca. NY: Cornell University Press, pp. 21-43.

Carey, S. (2002) 'Undivided Loyalties. Is National Identity an Obstacle to European Integration?' *European Union Politics* 3 (4): 387-413.

Castano, E. (2004) 'European Identity: A Social-Psychological Perspective', in R. K. Herrmann, M. Brewer, and T. Risse (eds), *Transnational Identities. Becoming European in the EU,* Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 40-58.

Checkel, J. T. (ed.) (forthcoming-a) *International Institutions and Socialization in Europe. Special Issue of International Organization,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

--- (forthcoming-b) 'International Institutions and Socialization in Europe: Introduction and Framework', *International Organization*.

Citrin, J., and Sides, J. (2004) 'More than Nationals: How Identity Choice Matters in the New Europe', in R. K. Herrmann, T. Risse, and M. Brewer (eds), *Transnational Identities. Becoming European in the EU,* Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 161-185.

Deutsch, K. W., et al. (1957) *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Diez Medrano, J. (2003) *Framing Europe: Attitudes toward European Integration in Germany, Spain, and the United Kingdom*, Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.

Duchêne, F. (1972) 'Europe in World Peace', in R. Mayne (ed.), *Europe Tomorrow,* London: Fontana/Collins, pp. 32-49.

Easton, D. (1965) *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*, New York: Wiley & Sons.

Engelmann-Martin, D. (2002) *Identity, Norms and German Foreign Policy: the Social Construction of Ostpolitik and European Monetary Union*, PhD. dissertation, Department of Social and Political Sciences, European University Institute, Florence.

European Council (2003) 'A secure Europe in a better world - European Security Strategy', Brussels: European Institute for Security Studies.

Guetzkow, H. (1955) 'Multiple Loyalties: Theoretical Approach to a Problem in International Organization', Princeton NJ: Centre for Research on World Political Institutions.

Haas, E. B. (1958) *The Uniting of Europe: Political, Social, and Economic Forces 1950-57,* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

--- (1964) *Beyond the Nation-State. Functionalism and International Organization*, Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.

--- (1970) 'The Study of Regional Integration: Reflections on the Joy and Anguish of Pretheorizing', *International Organization* 24 (4): 607-646.
--- (1990) *When Knowledge Is Power*, Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
--- (2000) 'Interview', October 30th, Berkeley.
--- (2001) 'Does Constructivism Subsume Neo-functionalism?' in T. Christiansen, K. E. Jorgensen, and A. Wiener (eds), *The Social Construction of Europe*, London et al.: Sage, pp. 22-31.
Haas, E. B., and Haas, P. M. (2002) 'Pragmatic Constructivism and the Study of International Institutions', *Millenium* 31 (3): 573-601.
Herrmann, R. K., Brewer, M., and Risse, T. (eds) (2004) *Transnational Identities. Becoming European in the EU, Governance in Europe*, Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
Hooghe, L. (2001) *The European Commission and the Integration of Europe. Images of Governance, Themes in European Governance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
--- (forthcoming) 'Many Roads Lead to International Norms, But Few Via International Socialization. A Case Study of the European Commission', *International Organization*.
Hooghe, L., and Marks, G. (2001) *Multi-Level Governance and European Integration*, Lanham MD et al.: Rowman & Littlefield.
--- (2004) 'Does Identity of Economic Rationality Drive Public Opinion on European Integration?' *PSOnline* www.apsanet.org (July): 1-5.
Jachtenfuchs, M. (2002) *Die Konstruktion Europas. Verfassungsideen und institutionelle Entwicklung, Weltpolitik im 21. Jahrhundert*, Baden-Baden: Nomos.
Jachtenfuchs, M., and Kohler-Koch, B. (eds.) (2003) *Europäische Integration, 2. Auflage*, Opladen: Leske & Budrich.
Joerges, C., Mény, Y., and Weiler, J. H. H. (2000) *What Kind of Constitution for What Kind of Polity?*, Florence: The Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, European University Institute.
Katzenstein, P. J. (ed.) (1997) *Tamed Power. Germany in Europe*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Kleine, M. (2003) *Die Reaktion der Europäischen Union auf die Terrorangriffe vom 11. September 2001 - Zu Kooperation und Nicht-Kooperation in der inneren und äußeren Sicherheit*, Diploma Thesis, Otto Suhr Institut für Politikwissenschaft, Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin.
Koenig-Archibugi, M. (2004) 'Explaining Government Preferences for Institutional Change in EU Foreign and Security Policy', *International Organization* 54 (1): 137-174.
Laffan, B. (2004) 'The European Union and Its Institutions as 'Identity Builders'', in R. K. Herrmann, T. Risse, and M. Brewer (eds), *Transnational Identities: Becoming European in the EU*, Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 75-96.
Lewis, J. (1998a) *Constructing Interests: The Committee of Permanent Representatives and Decision-Making in the European Union*, PhD. dissertation, Department of Political Science, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison WI.
--- (1998b) 'Wearing a Janus-Face: The Permanent Representatives of the European Union', Paper presented at Eleventh International Conference of Europeanists, at Baltimore MD.
--- (forthcoming) 'Nesting Identities in Brussels: Socialization and Everyday Decisionmaking in the European Union', *International Organization*.
Liebert, U., and Sifft, S. (2003) *Gendering Europeanisation*, Brussels: P.I.E. - Peter Lang.
March, J. G., and Olsen, J. P. (1989) *Rediscovering Institutions*, New York: The Free Press.
--- (1998) 'The Institutional Dynamics of International Political Orders', *International Organization* 52 (4): 943-69.
Marcussen, M., Risse, T., Engelmann-Martin, D., Knopf, H.-J., and Roscher, K. (1999) 'Constructing Europe. The Evolution of French, British, and German Nation-State Identities', *Journal of European Public Policy* 6 (4): 614-33.
Maull, H. W. (1990) 'Germany and Japan: The New Civilian Powers', *Foreign Affairs* 69 (5): 91-106.
Moravcsik, A. (1998) *The Choice for Europe: Social Purpose and State Power From Rome to Maastricht*, Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press.
Morgenthau, H. J. (1948) *Politics Among Nations*. Brief edition, 1993, New York: McGraw Hill.
Nelson, B. F., and Guth, J. (2000) 'Exploring the Gender Gap: Women, Men, and Public Attitudes toward European Integration', *European Union Politics* 1 (3): 191-217.
Parsons, C. (2002) 'Showing Ideas as Causes: The Origins of the European Union', *International Organization* 56 (1): 47-84.
--- (2003) *A Certain Idea of Europe*, Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press.
Risse, T. (2003) 'The Euro between national and European identity', *Journal of European Public Policy* 10 (4): 487-503.
Risse, T., and Engelmann-Martin, D. (2002) 'Identity Politics and European Integration: The Case of Germany', in A. Pagden (ed.), *The Idea of Europe. From Antiquity to the European Union*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 287-316.

Ruggie, J. G., Katzenstein, P. J., Keohane, R. O., and Schmitter, P. C. (2005) 'Transformations in World Politics: The Intellectual Contributions of Ernst B. Haas', *Annual Review of Political Science* 8.

Spence, J. M. (1998) 'The European Union. "A View from the Top" - Top Decision Makers and the European Union', Wavre: EOS Gallup Europe.

Waltz, K. (1979) *Theory of International Politics*, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Notes

* Thomas Risse ist Professor of International Politics and Dean of the Political and Social Science Division at the Freie Universität Berlin, Germany. He can be reached at: Otto Suhr Institute for Political Science, Freie Universität Berlin, Ihnestr. 22, 14195 Berlin, Germany, email: atasp@zedat.fu-berlin.de.

[1] I thank Tanja A. Börzel and an anonymous reviewer for critical comments and, above all, for turning around this article within three days!

[2] Incidentally, if people want to understand Emanuel Adler's middle ground theorizing about social constructivism and his work on social learning and cognitive evolution, they ought to read Ernst B. Haas first who was Adler's mentor.

[3] Ernst B. Haas also contributed to the now famous constructivist mantra of the mutual constitutiveness of agency and structure. Just read "Beyond the Nation-State"'s treatment of and attempt to reconciling functionalism and system theory (Haas 1964, 78-81).

[4] I thank Tanja Börzel for alerting me to this point.

[5] Haas completely acknowledged the common ground between neofunctionalism and intergovernmentalism and then wondered why Moravcsik in particular "makes such extraordinary efforts to distinguish his work from these sources" (Haas 2001, 30, note 10).

[6] A third concept of multiple identities pertains to cross-cutting loyalties. While I might strongly identify with my gender *and* with Europe, others who also identify with their gender must not identify with Europe at all (and vice versa).

[7] I thank the anonymous reviewer for alerting me to this point.

[8] Of course, one can also pinpoint external events and shocks such as September 11, 2001, to explain why internal security questions have become more integrated over time. See Kleine 2003.

[9] Never mind, however, that the same European nation-states that seem to be eager to preserve their sovereignty and autonomy in external affairs have been more than willing to give up sovereignty in many other issue-areas of political life which is completely inconsistent with this variant of realism.